

Remarks

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 21-22, 24, 26, 29, 33-34, 36 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,405,111 of *Rogers et al.* ("*Rogers*").

Claims 23, 25, 35, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of *Rogers* and U.S. Publication No. 2005/0210296 of *Devine et al.* ("*Devine*").

Claims 27-28, 30-32, 39 and 40-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of *Rogers* and U.S. Patent No. 6,591,367 of *Kobata et al.* ("*Kobata*").

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 21 is not anticipated by *Rogers* because *Rogers* does not disclose providing configuration data to a device in using an HTTP response "such that the HTTP response carries the configuration data to the device" as claimed in claim 21. *Rogers* discloses a controller 200 that accesses wheel alignment specifications stored in memory on a networked controller 220 (*Rogers*, col. 9, lines 51-59) and also discloses that the controller 200 and the networked controller 220 communicate using HTTP (*Rogers*, col. 9, lines 11-13) but does not teach that the networked controller 220 provides the wheel alignment specifications to the controller 200 using an HTTP response that carries the wheel alignment specifications to the controller 200 as claimed in claim 21. Instead, *Rogers* teaches that the wheel alignment system provided by the controllers 200 and 220 is implemented using ActiveX components in the controllers 200 and 220 (*Rogers*, col. 9, lines 18-22) and further teaches that ActiveX components communicate using a direct communication protocol that is outside of HTML, i.e. that is not an HTTP request/response protocol (*Rogers*, col. 6, lines 21-27). Figure 3 of *Rogers* clearly shows a direct

communication between ActiveX components in an HTTP browser 60 and an HTTP server 50 that is separate from the HTTP communication between the HTTP browser 60 and the HTTP server 50. (*Rogers*, col. 5, lines 65-67).

Given that claims 22-32 depend from claim 21, it is submitted that claims 22-32 are not anticipated by *Rogers*.

It is also submitted that claim 33 is not anticipated by *Rogers*. Claim 33 is a method for configuring a device that includes limitations similar to the limitations of claim 21. Therefore, the remarks stated above with respect to claim 21 and *Rogers* also apply to claim 33.

Given that claims 34-42 depend from claim 33, it is submitted that claims 34-42 are not anticipated by *Rogers*.

Applicant also submits that claims 23, 25, 35, and 37 are not obvious in view of *Rogers* and *Devine* because claims 23, 25, 35, and 37 depend from claims 21 and 33 and because *Rogers* and *Devine* do not disclose or suggest providing configuration data to a device in an HTTP response as claimed in claims 21 and 33. Applicant has shown that *Rogers* does not disclose or suggest the limitations of claims 21 and 33. *Devine* discloses a customer workstation 10 that downloads application objects (*Devine*, paragraph 50) but does not disclose or suggest providing configuration data to a device in an HTTP response as claimed in claims 21 and 33.

Applicant further submits that claims 27-28, 30-32, 39 and 40-42 are not obvious in view of *Rogers* and *Kobata* because claims 27-28, 30-32, 39 and 40-42 depend from claims 21 and 33 and because *Rogers* and *Kobata* do not disclose or suggest providing configuration data to a device in an HTTP response as claimed in claims 21 and 33. Applicant has shown that *Rogers* does not disclose or

suggest providing configuration data to a device in an HTTP response as claimed in claims 21 and 33. Kobata discloses a system for protecting messages from unauthorized access (Kobata, col. 2, lines 18-22) rather than providing configuration data to a device in an HTTP response as claimed in claims 21 and 33.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1078 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9-25-06

By: _____

Paul H. Horstmann

Paul H. Horstmann
Reg. No.: 36,167